

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 15, 2004. Claims 1-5, 9-15, 18, 31, 33, and 38-40 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 31, and 38-40 are in independent form. Claims 6-8, 16, 17, 19-30, 32, and 34-37 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter, and will not be mentioned further. Claims 38-40 have been added to provide Applicants with a more complete scope of protection. Claims 1-4, 9-12, 18, 31, and 33 have been amended to define Applicants' invention more clearly, and Claims 5 and 13-15 have been amended as to matters of form and to ensure consistency of terminology. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Examiner objected to the drawings on the grounds noted on page 2 of the Office Action.

As to reference number 1106, the specification has been amended on page 3, line 5, to change "1104-1105" to read --1104, 1105, and 1106--.

Reference number 1500 mentioned on page 3, line 4, has been amended to read --1005--.

Applicants submit that the above amendments to the specification obviate the drawing objections noted on page 2 of the Office Action, and that these changes add no new matter to the original disclosure. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the drawing objections.

The specification was objected to because of the informality noted on page 3 of the Office Action. Applicants have amended the specification in accordance with the Examiner's

suggestion. Accordingly, Applicants submit the objection to the specification has been overcome, and respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

Claims 1-5, 9-15, 18, 31, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,043,909 (*Holub*). Claims 1, 2, 5 and 9-11 were also rejected under Section 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,035,103 (*Zuber*).

As shown above, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1 and 31 in terms that more clearly define what they regard as their invention. Applicants submit that these amended independent claims and new independent Claims 38-40, together with the remaining claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

The present invention is directed to a copying machine that includes a scanner. The copying machine is controlled to perform calibration for other image output apparatuses connected via a network by using the scanner. Instructions for processing the calibration of the other image output apparatuses are easily inputted through an operation section/means of the copying machine.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 1 is to a copying machine that includes an image reading unit and an image output unit for printing an image read by the image reading unit. The copying machine comprises a network interface, an operation means, a pattern output means, a correction data generation means, and setting means. The network interface connects the copying machine to a network. The operation means displays a plurality of image output apparatuses connected to the network, and inputs a user instruction for selecting an

image output apparatus, for which calibration is performed, from the displayed plurality image output apparatuses. The pattern output means causes the selected image output apparatus to output a predetermined test pattern. The correction data generation means generates correction data for the selected image output apparatus, based on test pattern data obtained from the image reading unit which read the predetermined test pattern outputted by the selected image output apparatus, and the setting means sets the generated correction data as correction data for the selected image output apparatus.

Among other important features of Claim 1 are that, through a copying machine, a plurality of image output apparatuses connected to the network are displayed, and a user instruction is inputted for selecting an image output apparatus, for which calibration is performed, from the displayed image output apparatuses, and the calibration of the selected image output apparatus is controlled by causing the selected image output apparatus to output a predetermined test pattern, generating correction data based on test pattern data obtained from the image reading unit which read the predetermined test pattern outputted by the selected image output apparatus, and setting the generated correction data as correction data for the selected image output apparatus.

Holub relates to a system for distributing and controlling color reproduction at multiple sites. The system is controlled by computers at each node and utilizes a data structure, referred to as a Virtual Proof, to store and distribute color transformation information in the network.

Zuber relates to a electrophotographic printers, and more particularly, to a plurality of print engines configured in parallel to process print jobs in a parallel manner.

Both *Holub* and *Zuber* discuss performing calibration for an image output apparatus connected to a network. However, nothing has been found in either *Holub* or *Zuber* that would teach or suggest that, through a copying machine, a plurality of image output apparatuses connected to the network are displayed, and a user instruction is inputted for selecting an image output apparatus, for which calibration is performed, from the displayed image output apparatuses; and that the calibration of the selected image output apparatus is controlled by causing the selected image output apparatus to output a predetermined test pattern, generating correction data based on test pattern data obtained from the image reading unit which read the predetermined test pattern outputted by the selected image output apparatus, and setting the generated correction data as correction data for the selected image output apparatus, as recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants believe that Claim 1 is clearly patentable over the cited prior art.

Independent Claims 31 and 38-40 include features similar to those discussed above in connection with Claim 1. Accordingly, these claims are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above in connection with Claim 1.


The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above, and therefore are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the

invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,


Attorney for Applicants
Lock See Yu - JAMES
Registration No. 38,667

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 404302v1